Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.





9622 2T22

TECHNICAL PAPER No. 66 1962

THE EFFECTS OF SANITATION-SALVAGE CUTTING ON INSECT-CAUSED MORTALITY AT BLACKS MOUNTAIN EXPERIMENTAL FOREST 1938-1959

Boyd E. Wickman Charles B. Eaton

> U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE NATIONAL ADDA LIBRARY DEC 1 3 1962

> > CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

PACIFIC SOUTHWEST FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION BERKELEY - CALIFORNIA

O.A. NAL AUG 2 8 2008 CATALUGING PREP

FOREST SERVICE - U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the efforts of the many individuals who helped collect the information on which this report is based. Special mention is due K. A. Salman, who directed the entomological studies at Blacks Mountain during the early years; and J. W. Bongberg, who conducted the studies and later directed them until 1952, except during the war years of 1944 and 1945 when P. C. Johnson took charge. M. M. Furniss and G. L. Downing successfully carried on the studies from 1952 to 1956, when the senior author became responsible for this work. The authors also acknowledge the assistance of Charles Sartwell in compiling the records for this report. THE EFFECTS OF SANITATION-SALVAGE CUTTING

ON INSECT-CAUSED PINE MORTALITY AT

BLACKS MOUNTAIN EXPERIMENTAL FOREST: 1938-1959

By Boyd E. Wickman, and Charles B. Eaton

Contents

Page

THE SANITATION	-SALV	/AGE	C C	ON	ICE	PI		٠	•					٠	٠			۰				٠	2
APPLICATION AT	BLAC	KS	MO	UN	TA	IN	II	EXI	PER	RIN	Æ	TT	T	F(DRI	ES!	r.						3
The Experim	menta	al A	re	a	•	•	•	•	•				•	•				•			•		3
Insect Pro	blems	5.	•	•	•	•	÷	•	•	•			•		•		•					•	4
Cutting Pr	ocedu	ires		•	•	•	•	٠	•				•							•	•		7
SOURCE AND TRE	ATMEN	IT C)F	DA	TA		•	•	•	•		•	•				•	•				•	10
Data Colle	ctior	1.		•	•	•	•		•	•		•	•		٠		•	•	٠	•	•		10
Data Analy	sis .	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•		•			12
RESULTS		• •		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				14
Average Mo	rtali	Lty	fo	r	Pe	ri	loc	1 (of	St	sud	ly		•	•	•		٠			•		14
Mortality	by Ca	len	ıda	r-	Ye	ar		•	•	•	•	•			•				٠		٠		17
Mortality	by Su	icce	ess	iv	re	Nu	mt	bei	rs	of	2 1	Yea	ars	5 4	lft	te:	r						
Cuttin	g		•			•	•						•	•					•		•		17
Mortality 1	Reduc	etic	n	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•			•		•		19
CONCLUSIONS .		•	•		•	•	•	•							•		•	•	•		•	•	26
SUMMARY			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•							•		28
BIBLIOGRAPHY.				•		•	•						•	•	•			•					30
APPENDIX.																							32

76 Technical Paper, No. 66

501962/ 7 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOREST SERVICE, +7a 70 PACIFIC SOUTHWEST FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION + 76

Berkeley, California



THE EFFECTS OF SANITATION-SALVAGE CUTTING ON

INSECT-CAUSED PINE MORTALITY AT

BLACKS MOUNTAIN EXPERIMENTAL FOREST: 1938-1959

By

Boyd E. Wickman and Charles B. Eaton Entomologists

Destructive insects have long been a problem to foresters concerned with protecting and managing ponderosa-Jeffrey pine forests in northeastern California. Bark beetle depredations in this timber type have been one of the most disruptive influences affecting the conversion of old-growth stands. Until 1937, foresters managing eastside pine (as the type is called locally) had but one recourse for dealing with these pests. They located and felled trees that became infested, and treated them by one of several methods designed to kill the beetles beneath the bark. The most common procedure was peeling and burning the bark of the felled tree, a technique first described by Hopkins (1909). Other direct-control methods subsequently developed included burning the tree, using solar heat, and applying chemical insecticides to destroy beetles (Miller and Keen, 1960).

In 1937, a method of selective cutting was developed as a means of reducing insect damage to pine forests. This cutting practice soon came to be called sanitation-salvage. Insect-susceptible or high-risk trees were to be selectively logged before beetles could attack them. The opportunity for a large-scale test of this control method also occurred that year. It arose at the Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest in northeastern California, where the Forest Service had recently begun an ambitious program to investigate the silviculture and management of ponderosa and Jeffrey pine (Hallin, 1959). Bark beetles had already been recognized as a major obstacle to the management experiments planned there.

Records of insect-caused mortality in the compartments that were cut and in comparable uncut compartments were, and still are being maintained annually. Several analyses made during the first 10 years of the study amply demonstrated the success of sanitation-salvage in reducing insect-caused damage. Most of these analyses have not been published, although the earlier ones formed the basis for the first article about this work (Salman and Bongberg, 1942). Johnson (1946) analyzed the records of the first 7 years, and Bongberg (1949) did the same for the first 10 years. Neither published their findings, although their results were later summarized by other authors (Hallin, 1959; Miller and Keen, 1960). This study was originated by the Forest Insect Laboratory of the U.S. Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, which in 1954 became the Division of Forest Insect Research of the California (now Pacific Southwest) Forest and Range Experiment Station. It has been conducted in collaboration with the Station's Division of Forest Management Research since the beginning.

This report reviews the development of the sanitation-salvage concept and its application at Blacks Mountain. It presents results based on mortality records for 22 years through 1959. It contains an analysis of the data obtained and includes the findings and conclusions about the effectiveness of this approach for reducing insect-caused damage in the eastside pine type.

THE SANITATION-SALVAGE CONCEPT

For some years before 1937, forest entomologists had nurtured the idea that bark beetles in eastside pine could be controlled by methods other than direct suppression (Keen and Salman, 1942). One method they envisioned was selective cutting to harvest timber that these insects were likely to attack before the trees became infested. Beetle-killed trees deteriorate and decline rapidly in value. Thus it seemed reasonable to suppose that logging these susceptible trees before beetles attack them would, in one stroke, forestall large increases in insect abundance and retain the full mill value of the logged trees.

This indirect approach had a glaring weakness. Until 1937, forest entomologists had not decided what constituted a susceptible tree. Nor had they learned how to recognize such trees. However, they had uncovered some evidence on both scores. Person (1928), for example, found that bark beetles in old-growth ponderosa pine stands seemed to prefer trees growing less than 1 millimeter in diameter per year. Consequently, he advocated cutting the slowest growing trees to reduce the damage in these stands. Keen (1936), pursuing this lead, concluded that age and vigor indicated susceptibility in ponderosa pine. He proposed a system of tree classes based on bark and crown characters associated with age and vigor. These classes would differentiate the susceptible from the nonsusceptible trees. He also proposed marking ponderosa pine stands for a light selective cut designed to remove trees likely to foster infestations.

Both the growth rate and the tree classification theories had the same drawback as criteria for distinguishing susceptible trees. Neither was definitive enough to reveal the individuals in most immediate danger from bark beetles. The great outbreaks of the early 1930's highlighted this shortcoming, and they helped to spur the development of a somewhat different concept. The idea developed that the current health of a tree is symptomatic of its susceptibility or risk of beetle attack. Certain discernible crown characteristics, such as the length, color and abundance of the foliage, and the prevalence of crown weaknesses (dead or dying twigs or branches) were all taken to be indicators of risk. Characteristics used to distinguish four degrees of risk, ranging from risk 1 for the healthiest trees to risk 4 for the weakest ones, were first described by Salman (1938)^{-/} and later published by Salman and Bongberg (1942). Preliminary studies of ponderosa pine on the Modoc National Forest showed that by far the highest rate of mortality did, in fact, occur among the more susceptible trees, that is, those rated as risk 3 and risk 4 (Salman, 1937).^{-/} They also showed that these high-risk trees usually comprised a relatively small part of the stand. This suggested that logging the high-risk trees might be effective in reducing insectcaused damage.

APPLICATION AT BLACKS MOUNTAIN EXPERIMENTAL FOREST

THE EXPERIMENTAL AREA

In selecting Blacks Mountain as the site for management studies in the eastside pine type, forest research workers made an ideal choice for tests of selective logging to control bark beetles (fig. 1). Hallin (1959) has described the experimental forest there and its purposes. The following information is condensed from his account.

Created in 1934 from lands in Lassen County administered by the Lassen National Forest, the experimental forest contains 10,252 acres, of which 9,585 acres were timbered at the time of establishment. The area ranges in elevation from 5,600 to 6,900 feet above sea level, and its climate, site, and vegetation are representative of conditions found over most of the eastside type. The average stand per acre was 18,400 board feet at the time of the first inventory. Ponderosa and Jeffrey pine made up 90 percent of this volume; white fir, 7 percent; and incense-cedar, 3 percent. Hallin (1959) found that "the site index at age 100 years varies from 60 to 80 feet and averages 72 feet."

The forest resources were first inventoried in 1933 and 1934. A network of utilization roads was constructed during the next 3 years so that any single compartment could be reached and logged without disturbing adjoining compartments. The data obtained provided the basis for planning silvicultural treatments to be applied to the 100 compartments into which the experimental forest later was subdivided (fig. 2).

^{1/} Salman, K. A. Susceptibility classification for ponderosa and Jeffrey pine, eastside forests of northeastern California. U. S. Bur. Ent. and Plant Quar., Forest Insect Lab. Memo of May 5, 1938, 4 pp.

^{2/} Salman, K. A. Preliminary results-test markings of tree susceptibility. U.S. Bur. Ent. and Plant Quar., Forest Insect Lab. Memo of Dec. 14, 1937, 5 pp. Also U.S. Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine Project #7, selective logging study, Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest. Memo of April 5, 1937.



Figure 1. -- The experimental forest lies in the background, extending from Blacks Mountain on the left to Patterson Mountain on the right.

INSECT PROBLEMS

The insect problems of Blacks Mountain are typical of eastside pine. The two most destructive insect species are the western pine beetle (Dendroctonus brevicomis Lec.) in ponderosa pine, and the Jeffrey pine beetle (D. jeffreyi Hopk.) in Jeffrey pine. In California, ponderosa pine is about five times as abundant as Jeffrey pine, so that the western pine beetle is a much greater pest of eastside pine stands than is the Jeffrey pine beetle.

Other injurious insects include the California flatheaded borer (Melanophila californica Van Dyke), various species of Ips, and the red turpentine beetle (Dendroctonus valens Lec.). All of these beetles alone, or more often in combination with each other, attack both hosts. They all occur on the experimental forest. The mountain pine beetle (D. monticolae Hopk.) occasionally kills ponderosa pine, but more often it destroys in combination with other bark beetles.

Evidence of insect damage had become plentiful by 1933 when the resource inventory was started, and an epidemic of bark beetles was killing many ponderosa and Jeffrey pine trees throughout northern California. The magnitude of this damage is indicated by a survey in 1937 in which all of the trees killed on the experimental forest during the years 1933-1936 were measured (Anonymous, 1938). According to the results, insect-caused pine mortality during this period averaged 202 board feet per acre per year. These excessive losses occurred despite the fell-peel-burn control work done in 1934 (fig. 3), aimed at reducing the high bark beetle-caused losses. The mortality in 1937 averaged about 70 board feet per acre





Figure 3.--The fell-peel-burn method was used in the western pine beetle control project at Blacks Mountain in 1934 to kill brood in the bark.





(Bongberg, 1949), a considerable reduction from the annual average of the previous four years. But even at this reduced level the mortality was still so great as to interfere seriously with the silvicultural studies planned.

CUTTING PROCEDURES

The crystallization of much of the thinking about risk rating ponderosa pine trees according to their susceptibility to bark beetles occurred at this time. It created the opportunity needed to test the practicability and value of logging the high-risk trees as a beetlecontrol measure. Proponents of this approach maintained that removing these trees would involve cuts light enough so that areas could be covered rapidly; that values would be realized from these cuttings which otherwise would be lost to the insects; and that taking out the preferred host material, as the high-risk trees were rated, would keep bark beetles from increasing. However, proof for these claims was lacking.

Research foresters and forest entomologists together devised the plan for testing the validity of these ideas. Their primary objective, according to Salman² was "to determine the characteristics of susceptible trees, develop a practical classification of the relative susceptibility of pine trees on the area, and test that classification through application in methods of selective logging and management in which the more susceptible individuals are removed" (fig. 4).

The plan, as described by Johnson (1946), "provided for a series of sanitation-salvage cuttings to be applied as rapidly as possible to compartments showing the greatest insect hazard as a preliminary step to the silvicultural and management studies planned for the forest. The laboratory assumed responsibility for such technical details as (1) marking the trees to be removed by the cuttings, (2) suggesting the deployment of the cuttings according to the insect hazard of the compartments involved, (3) providing for means to check the insect control effectiveness of the cuttings, and (4) acting as consultant on entomological problems which arose during the cutting period."

This experiment station did all of the logging. Its Division of Forest Management Research had responsibility for the actual job of making sanitation-salvage and other types of cuttings. The division supervised logging activities, maintained cutting records, and handled other details (fig. 5). Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees logged the timber during the first few years. Thereafter, experienced lumberjacks were employed.

When a sanitation-salvage cut was made, all Risk 3 and Risk 4 trees were removed (fig. 6). In a few cases some of the less susceptible trees also were logged to bring the minimum average volume cut per acre to 2,500 board feet. When this study was started, logging lower volumes was not considered economically practicable.

^{3/} Memo of April 5, 1937; see footnote 2, page 3.



Figure 4.--High-risk ponderosa pine, left, is susceptible to western pine beetle attack. Low-risk ponderosa pine is on the right.



Figure 5.--White paint marked trees according to categories. One and two dots indicated low risk, three and four dots high risk. The latter types of trees were then removed by logging.



Figure 6.--Uncut, overmature ponderosa pine stand, Compartment G2-12 is shown at the top. A similar stand in G2-14, with high-risk trees removed by sanitation-salvage cut is shown below it. From modest beginnings in 1937, sanitation-salvage was extended in the next 14 years until all parts of the experimental forest intended for treatment had been covered. It came to be regarded as the first step in converting old-growth stands to a managed condition. It was applied to compartments that had not previously been cut; then later, silvicultural cuttings were made on most of them. These cuttings were also made on many compartments where no previous cutting had been done, but the highrisk trees there were removed from the stand at the same time (Hallin, 1959).

SOURCE AND TREATMENT OF DATA

This analysis is based upon records from less than half of the area cut on the experimental forest. Sanitation-salvage was done on most of the remaining area, but in various combinations with silvicultural cuttings, which obscure the effects of either method alone. Consequently the records from such areas were eliminated from consideration here. Also excluded are the records from the 20-acre method-of-cutting plots (Eaton, 1959).

Originally the pine-sawtimber stand per acre averaged about 17,000 board feet for the compartments included in this study. This is slightly below the average for the experimental forest as a whole. About 2,650 board feet per acre, representing 15.6 percent of the original pine volume, were removed from the sanitation-salvage compartments, leaving a reserve stand of 14,354 board feet per acre (table 1; table 10, appendix).

DATA COLLECTION

Much of the data on the compartments, such as timbered area, volume cut, and time of cutting, were obtained from records of the Division of Forest Management Research. Timbered area was determined from data taken during the first inventory. The volume of green pine 12 inches in diameter and larger was determined when compartments were marked for cutting, usually just ahead of logging. The only exception is the uncut compartments where original inventory data were used.

Most of the cutting was done during the warmer months of a single calendar year. However, year of cutting does not always correspond in this report to the calendar year in which a particular compartment was actually logged. The period between July 1 of one calendar year and June 30 of the next was taken as the cutting year, largely because of the attack habits of the insects involved. Thus, compartments logged between July 1, 1939 and June 30, 1940, for example, were listed under the 1939 year of cutting.

Since 1937, records of timber killed have been collected annually by making a 100 percent cruise of the cut and uncut areas. In the earlier years this was a major undertaking, because until 1947 the entire experimental forest had to be surveyed each season to locate trees that were infested or had been killed. Beginning in 1948, the cruise was restricted to uncut compartments and those cut by the sanitation-salvage method only. The cruises usually have been made in early summer by a 3-man crew headed by an entomologist (fig. 7). Mortality cruises on the sanitation-salvage areas were discontinued when such areas were recut.

Table 1. -- Area, number of trees, and volume of pine sawtimber

stand	per	acre	e before	and	after	cutting,	by	treatment
and y	ear	of cu	itting ¹					

Year :	A.700	:Origina	l stand	L: Ci	it	: Reserv	e stand	•	Percent
of cutting ^{2/} :	acres	:Number: :trees :	Volume	:Number: :trees :	Volume	:Number: :trees :	Volume	•	volume cut
			Board feet		Board feet				Board feet
			Sanit	ation-Sal	Lvage				
1937 1938 1939 1940 1941 1942 1944 1951	302.0 377.9 596.7 603.1 800.1 212.3 66.6 244.4	22.5 21.2 16.4 17.9 17.7 14.1 21.5 22.3	19,320 17,512 15,852 16,277 17,169 17,327 16,109 17,431	2.5 2.9 2.1 1.7 1.7 1.1 1.5 1.7	2,976 3,112 3,048 2,267 2,614 2,380 2,085 2,057	20.0 18.3 14.3 16.2 16.0 13.0 20.0 20.6	16,344 14,400 12,804 14,010 14,555 14,947 14,024 15,374		15.4 17.8 19.2 13.9 15.2 13.7 12.9 11.8
Subtotal	3,203.6								
Average		18.5	17,007	1.9	2,653	16.6	14,354		15.6
			Ŭ	Intreated					
	470.9	19.8	16,198	0	0	19.8	16,198		0
Subtotal	470.9	19.8	16,198	0	0	19.8	16,198		0
Total	3,674.5								
Average		18.7	16,903						

Condensed from table 10.

1/

2/ All compartments logged between July 1 of the year listed and the following June 30 are grouped under the same year of cutting except as follows: Compartments included in the cutting year 1937 were logged between August 1, 1937 and June 30, 1938; the compartment included in the cutting year 1944 was logged between July 1, 1944 and November 1, 1945.



Figure 7.--Compassman marks the exact location of bark beetle-killed tree on a compartment map.

The mortality data collected for each dead tree found includes its location, species, diameter, and year and cause of death (Downing, 1956). Generally only trees in the 12-inch diameter class and larger were tallied; smaller trees that were occasionally recorded have been excluded from this analysis because they usually are killed by other causes than those affecting the merchantable size classes.

DATA ANALYSIS

Johnson (1946) has pointed out that "the control effect of a sanitation-salvage cutting is represented by the difference between the subsequent insect-caused pine mortality in the cutover stand and that in comparable uncut stands." In the early years of the study this was not difficult to determine by direct comparison of cut and uncut areas. The high-hazard compartments, believed to be most vulnerable to insect attack, were logged first; but it took several years to get over these areas, and for a time enough of them remained uncut so that such comparisons seemed valid. Eventually, however, all high-hazard compartments were cut. When this happened Johnson concluded that some change in the method used to evaluate the results was needed because he did not consider records from high- and low-hazard stands directly comparable. Records of the mortality history of the experimental forest during the 1930's supported Johnson's ideas. They indicated that bark beetles did considerably more damage during this period in the high-hazard compartments than in the forest as a whole. In analyzing the first seven years of the sanitation-salvage experiment, Johnson assumed "that (1) the precutting mortality rate of the cut compartments could be projected over the post-cutting years in accordance with the natural mortality trend... on the virgin (uncut) compartments of the forest; (2) the 'predicted mortality' thus obtained...would be a valid expression of the mortality which would have occurred on the cut compartments had no cuttings been made; and (3) the difference between this 'predicted mortality' and the mortality, and hence the amount of insect control effected by the cuttings." Bongberg also used the concept of predicted mortality in his later analysis of the first 10 years' records (1949).

Whether we can safely assume that the precutting mortality rate can be projected over the post-cutting period for 22 or more years is open to question. Preliminary analyses showed that this assumption tends to place undue weight on the heavy losses of the mid-1930's. Thus, when predicted mortality was computed for compartments with a known loss history, it did not accurately reflect the actual mortality that occurred over the 22 years. Predicted mortality was consistently higher than the actual mortality, although it showed the same trends.

Salman (1935) found that in the pondersa pine type of California, losses from insects in cutover stands followed the same general pattern as in uncut stands, except for the lower volume. This study amply supports his conclusion. With this in mind, and knowing the deficiencies of the predicted mortality method, we have reverted to direct comparison of the losses on cut and uncut areas as the basis for evaluating the effectiveness of sanitation-salvage. This method seems a better choice than predicted mortality, despite its failure to account for differences in hazard in various areas.

The data have been handled in the same general way in this analysis as was done in analyzing similar records from methods-of-cutting plots (Eaton, 1959). Losses from insects were segregated from those due to other causes, such as lightning and wind. The records then were compiled to show average annual mortality in the cut and uncut compartments for the following periods: (a) entire post-cutting period, (b) calendar year after cutting, and (c) successive numbers of years after cutting. Both board feet and percent of stand per acre are used to express the results. Percent of stand is the better unit for many comparisons, since it compensates for differences in the amount of timber available for insects to attack.

We have not attempted to take into account ingrowth, either from trees that reached sawtimber size, or from the additional growth on trees in the reserve stand during the post-cutting period. Furthermore, the volume that died each year has not been deducted from the reserve stand volume, because preliminary analyses showed that this refinement had very little effect on the results. Ingrowth would be expected to offset mortality, at least in part, but to what extent it actually did so in this study is not known.

RESULTS

Only five compartments totaling 470.9 acres were left uncut for the entire period of study; but since compartments scheduled for sanitationsalvage could not all be logged at once they were treated as part of the uncut area until they were logged (table 10, appendix). Conversely, only one 81.3-acre compartment of the four cut by sanitation-salvage in 1937 has continuous records for the entire period; but as more compartments were logged in later years, they were added to the sanitation-salvage column. The net result is that for the early years of the study, the mortality records are based on relatively large uncut compared to cut areas; for the later years the reverse is true.

AVERAGE MORTALITY FOR PERIOD OF STUDY

The average annual pine mortality from all causes for the 22 years was far less in stands where sanitation-salvage logging had been done than in those left uncut (table 2). On the sanitation-salvage areas, mortality amounted to 26 board feet per acre per year, compared with 109 board feet for the uncut areas. In terms of percent of stand, three and one-half times as much timber was killed on the latter as on the former.

Course :	Treatment and	l weighted mean	reserve stand vol	ume (board feet)				
vaube :	Sanitation	-salvage 13,682	: Untreated 16,358					
	Board feet	Percent stand	Board feet	Percent stand				
Insects	19.50	0.143	99.50	0.608				
Wind	5.79	.042	6.25	• 038				
Lightning	• 34	.002	.46	.003				
Other	• 34	.002	3.00	.018				
Total	25.97	.189	109.21	.667				

Table 2. -- Average volume of pine sawtimber reserve per acre killed

annually, by cause, 1938-1959

Insects accounted for most of the dead timber--much more than all other causes combined--in both cut and uncut areas. Of the reserve stand losses following sanitation-salvage, 75 percent were due to insects; in stands where no cutting was done, 91 percent of the losses were insectcaused. Wind was the next most destructive agent. It did considerably less damage than insects, although causing a much higher proportion of the total mortality on the cut compartments than on the uncut.

Average annual insect-caused mortality for individual compartments varied considerably, particularly among those with short records (table 11, appendix). For the sanitation-salvage compartments, it ranged from 0 to 40.8 board feet per acre, and the mean was 19.5 board feet. For compartments where no cutting was done, this mortality ranged from 9.4 to 249.2 board feet per acre and the mean was 99.5 board feet. Over the 22 years, insects did more than four times as much damage in the stands containing high-risk trees as in those that did not (fig. 8).

One source of variation in the records is the year of cutting, because insect-caused mortality in the treated compartments did not equal

Figure 8.--Five ponderosa pine trees killed by western pine beetle at Blacks Mountain. This type of loss was not uncommon on the uncut compartments.



a fourth of that in the untreated areas for all cutting years. This is evident from the data in table 3 where the records for the sanitationsalvage and corresponding untreated compartments have been grouped according to the year when the cutting was done. On this basis the greatest differences occurred in the logged compartments where, except for 1942, annual mortality ranged from a low of 0.10 percent of stand for 1938 to 0.29 percent of stand for 1944. By contrast the range in mortality for the untreated compartments was much narrower, the minimum being 0.58 percent of the stand for 1939, 1940, and 1951, and the maximum 0.71 for 1944.

Table	3Average	annual ins	ect-caused	mortality	of	pine sawtir	nber
	reserve	per acre o	n sanitatio	on-salvage	and	untreated	areas,
	by year	of cutting	, 1938-1959	9			

Year	•	:	: Mean	: An	nual m	ortality	
of cutting	: Treatment	: Area	: reserve : stand	Mean	SE	: Percent : stand	
	2	Acres	Boa	ard feet			
1937	Sanitation-salvage Untreated	302.0 2,415.6	16,344 16,339	25.2± 96.8±	3.3 5.4	0.15 .59	
1938	Sanitation-salvage Untreated	377.9 1,942.3	14,400 16,695	13.9± 100.6±	2.5 5.8	.10 .60	
1939	Sanitation-salvage Untreated	596.7 1,447.1	12,804 16,929	14.7± 97.9±	3.4 6.0	. 12 . 58	
1940	Sanitation-salvage Untreated	603.1 919.3	14,010 16,465	24.1± 95.5±	4.4 6.3	.17 .58	
1941	Sanitation-salvage Untreated	800.1 707.0	14,555 16,206	19.8± 99.7±	2.9 6.6	.14	
1942	Sanitation-salvage Untreated	212.3 707.0	14,946 16,206	3.7± 103.8±	3.7 6.9	.02 .64	
1944	Sanitation-salvage Untreated	66.6 640.4	14,024 16,216	40.8± 115.3±	7.8 7.4	.29 .71	
1951	Sanitation-salvage Untreated	244.4 470.9	15,374 16,198	30.0± 93.6±	6.6 10.4	•20 •58	

The length of record probably accounts for much of the difference in the mortality rate between areas cut in different years. The extremely low mortality for the area cut in 1942, for example, is based on only 4 years' records. For all other cutting years except this one, insects did between two and one-half and six times as much damage in untreated areas as on the sanitation-salvage areas.

-16-

MORTALITY BY CALENDAR-YEAR

Insect-caused mortality fluctuated considerably from one calendar year to the next. These changes are to be expected, and for the most part they undoubtedly are a manifestation of interactions between the insects and their environment, as Eaton (1959) pointed out. The greatest damage occurred in 1956 when the volume of timber killed exceeded 48 board feet per acre in the sanitation-salvage compartments and 207 board feet per acre in the uncut compartments (table 4). These losses are equivalent to 0.37 and 1.28 percent of stand, respectively. Insects did the least damage in 1943, killing only 2.3 board feet per acre (0.02 percent of stand) in the logged stands and 26 board feet per acre (0.16 percent of stand) in those that had not been logged.

Significantly, the mortality was consistently much lower in the sanitation-salvage compartments than in the uncut compartments (fig. 9). Fluctuations from year to year were somewhat more pronounced in the former than in the uncut areas, but the mortality trends for both were remarkably similar over the entire 22-year period. These results confirm Salman's (1935) findings that losses in cutover stands follow the same general pattern as those in uncut stands, except for being lower in volume.

MORTALITY BY SUCCESSIVE NUMBERS OF YEARS AFTER CUTTING

This favorable picture for sanitation-salvage by calendar years would be complete except that the cuttings had to be spread over several years. Thus these mortality records represent a mixture of recent and old treatments, and the results are bound to be colored to some extent by differences in the amount of damage that occurred from one year to the next.

A more meaningful measure of the effects of sanitation-salvage can be expected if we refer to records of elapsed time since the cutting was done, irrespective of calendar years. Grouped in this way, the data should show trends resulting from the treatment that otherwise might not be evident, and they should help to answer this important question: "How long do the effects of sanitation-salvage last?"

The mortality data for each calendar year were rearranged by successive numbers of years after cutting. We pooled the records for the first year after cutting, second year after cutting, third year after cutting, and so forth, without regard to the calendar year in which the losses took place. Thus, mortality during the first year after cutting under sanitationsalvage (table 8, appendix) was calculated by combining the 1938 data for compartments cut in 1937, the 1939 data for compartments cut in 1938, the 1940 data for compartments cut in 1939, and so forth. Mortality the second year after cutting was compiled in a like manner by combining the 1939 records for compartments cut in 1937, and the 1940 records for compartments cut in 1938. The same procedure was followed with the data in table 9, appendix, to obtain the mortality referred to in the same time periods for the uncut areas.

Year	: Area	: Res	serve stand		Annu	al mo	ortality
	Acres	I	Board feet		Board feet		Percent stand
			Sanitation	n-sa	lvage		
1938	302.0		16,345		16.8		0.10
1939	679.9		15,264		27.5		.18
1940	1,276.6		14,114		10.5		.07
1941	1,879.7		14,081		7.9		• 06
1942	2,679.8		14,222		4.6		.03
1943	2,479.1		14,097		2.3		. 02
1944	1,0/2.2		13,031		120		.05
1945	⊥,40(•) 1 µ∩1 µ		13 377		15.9		.12
1940 1947	1 322.4		13,345		8.9		.07
1948	1.322.4		13,345		20.0		.15
1949	1,322.4		13,345		45.8		• 34
1950	1,322.4		13,345		45.2		• 34
1951	1,322.4		13,345		41.6		.31
1952	1,566.8		13,662		31.3		.23
1953	1,566.8		13,662	~~~	31.4		•23
1954	1,426.7		13,577		15.2		• 11
1955	953•7		13,051		20.7		• 10 27
1956	953.7		13,071		40.9 21: 1:		• 21
1921	859.2		13,002		8.9		.20
1959	859.2		13,002		31.8		.24
			Intr	eate	Б		
1938	2.415.6		16.339		75.2		0.46
1939	1,942.3		16,695		117.0		.70
1940	1,447.1		16,929		122.7		.72
1941	919.3		16,465		52.1		• 32
1942	707.0		16,206		50.2		• 31
1943	707.0		16,206		26.0		• 16
1944	640.4		16,216		50.8		. • <u>3</u> ⊥ 78
1945	640.4		16,210		120.9		• /0
1940	640.4		16,210		89.1		•
1941	640.4		16,216		132.1		.81
1949	640.4		16.216		157.0		•97
1950	640.4		16,216		197.4		1.22
1951	470.9		16,198		181.7		1.08
1952	470.9		16,198		119.4		•74
1953	470.9		16,198		60.0		• 37
1954	470.9		16,198		82.2		• 51
1955	470.9		16,198		96.3		• 77
1956	4.(0.9		16,190		68 0		1.20
1058	410.9		16 198		93.8		.58
1959	470.9		16,198		66.0		.41

Table 4.--Average annual insect-caused mortality of pine sawtimber reserve per acre by calendar years, 1938-1959

When we group data in this fashion (table 5), the acreage base, for obvious reasons, is broadest for the first year after cutting and becomes progressively smaller to the twenty-second year. Moreover, the base for the uncut area is much larger than that for the sanitation-salvage. Even the 22-year record is based on considerably more acreage of uncut than cut compartments, but these differences in area do not seem to have appreciably affected the outcome.

This comparison showed that removing the high-risk trees resulted in great reductions in damage on the cut versus the uncut compartments. And, as expected, the effect of the treatment on mortality in successive numbers of years after cutting was more consistent and more pronounced (fig. 10). In only one year did mortality on the treated area approach that on the untreated: in the twentieth year after cutting, the losses were 0.45 and 0.47 percent of the stand. Over the 22 years, mortality on the sanitation-salvage compartments ranged from a low of 0.03 percent of stand during the third year after cutting to a high of 0.45 percent of stand in the twentieth year. In the uncut compartments, the results ranged from 0.41 percent of stand in the twenty-second year after cutting to 0.91 percent in the twelfth year.

When the yearly losses shown on table 5 are cumulated, the contrast in amounts of timber killed on the sanitation-salvage compartments and on those from unlogged stands is even more striking than it is in the individual year comparison. To derive cumulative percent of stand mortality, mean annual mortalities in board feet were added together for different intervals after cutting, ranging from 1 up to 22 years. Then the cumulative board feet mortality for each time period was computed as a percent of the weighted mean reserve stand volume for the treatment (from table 11, appendix). The results (table 6) show that the total volume of timber killed in the sanitation-salvage compartments after logging was only 3.76 percent of stand. In the unlogged compartments during the same period, the mortality totaled 13.96 percent of stand. These values are equivalent to 515 and 2,281 board feet per acre, respectively. Figure 11 shows the upward trends in cumulative mortality on the treated and untreated areas throughout the study period.

MORTALITY REDUCTION

If sanitation-salvage had had no effect in reducing the volume of timber killed by insects, percent of stand mortality after cutting would have been about the same on the logged as on the unlogged compartments. The 22-year record shows clearly that this was not the case regardless of the time period used in making mortality comparisons. The difference between treated and untreated areas, that is, the percent of reduction in mortality between the two types of compartments best illustrates the effect of removing the high-risk trees. Percent reduction by calendar years annually, and by successive numbers of years after cutting annually and cumulatively, has been computed from the data obtained (table 7). The formula for computing percent reduction embodies the same principle used in calculating "percent control" from insecticide treatments, and as used here the two terms are quite comparable.



Figure 9.--Insect-caused pine sawtimber mortality on cut and uncut compartments for the calendar years 1938 to 1959.



Figure 10.--Insect-caused pine sawtimber mortality on cut and uncut compartments in successive numbers of years after cutting.

Area Reserve stand Annual mortality Acres Board feet Board feet Percent stand Sanitation-salvage IL, 7 0.10 2 3,076.9 14,355 IL, 7 0.10 2 3,076.9 14,356 1.4 0.66 3 2,905.2 14,316 4.0 0.33 4 2,136.3 14,258 1.1.4 0.06 5 1,845.6 13,673 9.3 0.77 6 1,645.8 13,673 30.4 22 9 1,401.4 13,3177 26.6 220 10 1,322.4 13,345 34.5 26.6 12 1,322.4 13,345 54.0 .40 13 1,322.4 13,345 14.2 .11 14 1,167.9 13,146 25.0 .19 15 99.9 12,662 26.2 .21 16 708.5 12,548 33.8 .27 17 795.1 12,616 27.1 .21 18	Year after	• •		•	
Acres Board feet Board feet Board feet Board feet Percent stand 1 3,203.1 14,354 14.7 0.10 2 3,076.9 14,396 8.1 0.66 3 2,905.2 14,316 4.0 0.3 4 2,136.3 14,258 11.4 0.66 5 1,645.6 14,134 15.4 11 6 1,645.8 13,673 9.3 0.7 8 1,645.8 13,673 9.3 0.7 8 1,645.8 13,673 9.3 0.7 8 1,645.8 13,673 9.2 2.66 10 1,322.4 13,345 34.5 2.66 12 1,322.4 13,345 14.2 11 14 1,367.9 13,146 27.0 19 15 939.9 12,662 26.2 2.1 16 708.3 12,548 33.6 27 17 5	cutting	Area	Reserve stand	Annual	mortality
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Acres	Board feet	Board feet	Percent stand
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Sanitation	-salvage	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	3.203.1	14.354	14.7	0.10
3 $2,90;2,2$ $14,336$ $4,0$ 0.3 4 $2,136;3$ $14,258$ $11,4$ 0.86 5 $1,645;6$ $14,134$ $15,4$ 11 6 $1,645;6$ $13,673$ $9,3$ 07 8 $1,645;6$ $13,673$ $9,3$ 07 8 $1,645;6$ $13,673$ $90,4$ 222 9 $1,401,4$ $13,377$ $26;6$ 220 10 $1,322,4$ $13,345$ $34,5$ $26;6$ 12 $1,322,4$ $13,345$ $54,0$ 40 13 $1,322,4$ $13,345$ $54,0$ 40 13 $1,322,4$ $13,345$ $54,0$ 40 14 $1,187,9$ $13,146$ $25,0$ 19 15 $939,9$ $12,662$ $26,2$ 21 16 $768,3$ $12,294$ $10,958$ $18,2$ 17 17 $293,99$ $12,662$ $26,2$ 21 17 $29,249,6$ $16,424$ $17,7$ <td>2</td> <td>3,076,9</td> <td>14.396</td> <td>8.1</td> <td>06</td>	2	3,076,9	14.396	8.1	06
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2	2,005,2	11, 216	1.0	.00
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5 1	0 1 26 8	14,010	4.0	.05
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4	2,130.0	14,200	11.4	.00
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2	1,845.6	14,134	15.4	• 11
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	6	1,645.8	13,673	14.9	. 11
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	7	1,645.8	13,673	9.3	.07
9 1,401.4 13,377 26.6 .20 10 1,322.4 13,345 35.2 .26 11 1,322.4 13,345 34.5 .26 12 1,322.4 13,345 14.2 .11 14 1,187.9 13,146 25.0 .19 15 939.9 12,662 26.2 .21 16 708.3 12,548 33.8 .27 17 595.1 12,616 27.1 .21 18 548.2 11,820 19.0 .16 19 372.4 10,958 18.2 .17 20 308.9 11,336 51.3 .45 21 177.0 12,755 21.4 .17 22 81.3 13,057 20.2 .16 1 9,249.6 16,482 89.3 0.54 2 7,474.4 16,506 82.7 .50 3 6,172.5 16,417 79.2 .48 4 5,355.8 16,254 73.8 .45 5 5,086.9 16,212 93.1 .57 6 5,020.3 16,212 93.1 .57 6 5,020.3 16,212 112.1 .69 7 4,784.2 16,212 112.1 .69 9 4,143.8 16,212 112.1 .69 9 4,143.8 16,212 122.9 .76 9 4,143.8 16,212 122.9 .76 9 4,143.8 16,212 122.9 .76 9 4,143.8 16,212 122.1 .69 1 3,974.3 16,210 138.2 .85 11 3,005.3 16,207 138.5 .85 12 3,635.3 16,204 146.8 .91 13 3,465.8 16,207 138.5 .85 12 3,635.3 16,204 146.8 .91 13 3,445.8 16,202 .77 14 3,296.3 16,198 100.3 .63 17 2,825.4 16,198 101.3 .63 17 2,825.4 16,198 102.3 .63 18 2,354.5 16,198 102.3 .63 17 2,825.4 16,198 102.3 .63 18 2,354.5 16,198 102.3 .63 19 1,883.6 6.198 102.3 .63 10 2,354.5 16,198 102.3 .63 10 2,354.5 16,198 102.3 .63 11 2,354.5 16,198 105.4 .66 19 1,883.6 6.198 106.4 .66 19 1,883.6 6.198 108.9 .67 20 1,412.7 16,198 75.9 .47 21 941.8 16,198 101.3 .63 17 2,825.4 16,198 102.3 .63 18 2,354.5 16,198 105.4 .66 19 1,883.6 6.208 6.20 .47 21 941.8 16,198 105.9 .67 20 1,412.7 16,198 75.9 .47 21 941.8 16,198 105.9 .47 21 941.8 16,198 105.9 .47 21 941.8 16,198 105.9 .47 21 941.8 16,198 105.9 .47 21	8	1,645.8	13,673	30.4	.22
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	9	1,401.4	13,377	26.6	.20
11 1,322.4 13,345 34.5 .26 12 1,322.4 13,345 14.2 .11 13 1,322.4 13,345 14.2 .11 14 1,187.9 13,146 25.0 .19 15 939.9 12,662 26.2 .21 16 708.3 12,548 33.8 .27 17 595.1 12,616 27.1 .21 18 548.2 11,320 19.0 .16 19 372.4 10,958 18.2 .17 20 308.9 11,336 51.3 .45 21 177.0 12,755 21.4 .17 22 81.3 13,057 20.2 .16 Untreated 1 9,249.6 16,482 89.3 0.54 2 7,474.4 16,506 82.7 .50 3 6,172.5 16,417 79.2 .46 4 5,355.8 16,213 96.2 .59 7 79.2 .48 </td <td>10</td> <td>1,322.4</td> <td>13,345</td> <td>35.2</td> <td>.26</td>	10	1,322.4	13,345	35.2	.26
12 1,322.4 13,345 54.0 .40 13 1,322.4 13,345 14.2 .11 14 1,187.9 13,146 25.0 .19 15 939.9 12,662 26.2 .21 16 708.3 12,548 33.8 .27 17 595.1 12,616 27.1 .21 18 548.2 11,820 19.0 .16 19 372.4 10,958 18.2 .17 20 308.9 11,336 51.3 .45 21 177.0 12,755 21.4 .17 22 81.3 13,057 20.2 .16 19 372.4 16,506 82.7 .50 3 6,172.5 16,417 79.2 .48 4 5,365.8 16,224 93.1 .57 5 5,086.9 16,212 93.1 .57 6 5,020.3 16,212 128.7 .79 19 4,784.2 16,212 128.7 .79	11	1,322.4	13,345	34.5	•26
13 1,322.4 13,345 14.2 11 14 1,187.9 13,146 25.0 19 15 939.9 12,662 26.2 21 16 708.3 12,548 33.8 27 17 595.1 12,616 27.1 21 18 548.2 11,820 19.0 16 19 372.4 10,958 18.2 1.7 20 308.9 11,336 51.3 .45 21 177.0 12,755 21.4 .17 22 81.3 13,057 20.2 .16 Untreated 1 9,249.6 16,482 89.3 0.54 2 7,474.4 16,506 82.7 .50 3 6,172.5 16,417 79.2 .48 4 5,365.8 16,254 73.8 .45 5 5,086.9 16,212 93.1 .57 6 5,020.3 16,213 96.2 .59 7 4,784.2 16,212 <td>12</td> <td>1.322.4</td> <td>13,345</td> <td>54.0</td> <td>.40</td>	12	1.322.4	13,345	54.0	.40
14 1,187.9 13,146 25.0 19 15 939.9 12,662 26.2 21 16 708.3 12,548 33.8 27 17 595.1 12,616 27.1 21 18 548.2 11,820 19.0 .16 19 372.4 10,958 18.2 .17 20 308.9 11,336 51.3 .45 21 177.0 12,755 21.4 .17 22 81.3 13,057 20.2 .16 Untreated 2 7,474.4 16,506 82.7 .50 3 6,172.5 16,417 79.2 .48 4 5,365.8 16,254 73.8 .45 5 5,086.9 16,213 96.2 .59 7 4,784.2 16,212 112.1 .69 8 4,784.2 16,212 128.7 .79 10 3,974.3 16,210 138.2 .85 11 3,804.8 16,20	13	1.322.4	13,345	14.2	. 11
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	14 14	1,187,9	13,146	25.0	10
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	15	939.9	12 662	26.2	•
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	16	708.8	10 548	20.2	• 2 1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10	FOE 1	10,616	22.0	• ~ (
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		797•1	12,010	21.1	•21
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10	540.2	11,020	19.0	• 16
20 306.9 $11,336$ 51.3 $.45$ 21 177.0 $12,755$ 21.4 $.17$ 22 81.3 $13,057$ 20.2 $.16$ 1 $9,249.6$ $16,482$ 89.3 0.54 2 $7,474.4$ $16,506$ 82.7 $.50$ 3 $6,172.5$ $16,417$ 79.2 $.48$ 4 $5,365.8$ $16,254$ 73.8 $.445$ 5 $5,086.9$ $16,212$ 93.1 $.57$ 6 $5,020.3$ $16,213$ 96.2 $.59$ 7 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 112.1 $.69$ 8 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,445.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 90.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.47$	19	3(2.4	10,958	18.2	.17
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	20	308.9	11,336	51.3	• 45
22 81.3 $13,057$ 20.2 $.16$ Untreated1 $9,249.6$ $16,482$ 89.3 0.54 2 $7,474.4$ $16,506$ 82.7 $.50$ 3 $6,172.5$ $16,417$ 79.2 $.48$ 4 $5,365.8$ $16,254$ 73.8 $.45$ 5 $5,086.9$ $16,212$ 93.1 $.57$ 6 $5,020.3$ $16,213$ 96.2 $.59$ 7 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 112.1 $.69$ 8 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 128.7 $.79$ 10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 19 $1,883.6$ $16,198$ 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	21	177.0	12,755	21.4	.17
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	22	81.3	13,057	20.2	.16
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Untre	ated	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	l	9,249.6	16,482	89.3	0.54
3 $6,172.5$ $16,417$ 79.2 $.48$ 4 $5,365.8$ $16,254$ 73.8 $.45$ 5 $5,086.9$ $16,212$ 93.1 $.57$ 6 $5,020.3$ $16,213$ 96.2 $.59$ 7 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 112.1 $.69$ 8 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 128.7 $.79$ 10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ $16,198$ 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	2	7,474.4	16,506	82.7	• 50
4 $5,365.8$ $16,254$ 73.8 $.45$ 5 $5,086.9$ $16,212$ 93.1 $.57$ 6 $5,020.3$ $16,213$ 96.2 $.59$ 7 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 112.1 $.69$ 8 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 128.7 $.79$ 10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$ 22 470.9 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	3	6,172.5	16,417	79.2	. 48
5 $5,086.9$ $16,212$ 93.1 $.57$ 6 $5,020.3$ $16,213$ 96.2 $.59$ 7 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 112.1 $.69$ 8 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 128.7 $.79$ 10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	ũ,	5.365.8	16.254	73.8	45
6 $5,020.3$ $16,213$ 96.2 59 7 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 112.1 69 8 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 128.7 $.79$ 10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.666$ 19 $1,883.6$ $16,198$ 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	5	5.086.9	16.212	93.1	57
7 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 112.1 $.69$ 8 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 128.7 $.79$ 10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	6	5,020,3	16,213	06.2	• 21
8 $4,784.2$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.76$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 128.7 $.79$ 10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	7	4.784.2	16 212	1101	•) >
0 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 122.9 $.16$ 9 $4,143.8$ $16,212$ 128.7 $.79$ 10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	8	1,781,2	16 212	100 0	•09
94,145.016,212120.7.7910 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 .8511 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 .8512 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 .9113 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 .7314 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 .7415 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 .6216 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 .6317 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 .6318 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 .6619 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 .6720 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 .4721 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 .49	0	h 1/2 8	16,010	100 7	• (0
10 $3,974.3$ $16,210$ 138.2 $.85$ 11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	20	4,143.0	10,212	120. (• 79
11 $3,804.8$ $16,207$ 138.5 $.85$ 12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$	10	3,914.3	16,210	138.2	.85
12 $3,635.3$ $16,204$ 146.8 $.91$ 13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 $.73$ 14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$ 22 470.9 $16,198$ 66.0 112	11	3,004.0	16,207	138.5	.85
13 $3,465.8$ $16,201$ 119.0 .7314 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 .7415 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 .6216 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 .6317 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 .6318 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 .6619 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 .6720 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 .4721 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 .4922 470.9 $16,198$ 66.0 .10	12	3,635.3	16,204	146.8	•91
14 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 120.2 $.74$ 15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$ 22 470.9 $16,198$ 66.0 102.3	13	3,465.8	16,201	119.0	•73
15 $3,296.3$ $16,198$ 99.9 $.62$ 16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$ 22 470.9 $16,198$ 66.0 $.10$	14	3,296.3	16,198	120.2	• 74
16 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 101.3 $.63$ 17 $2,825.4$ $16,198$ 102.3 $.63$ 18 $2,354.5$ $16,198$ 106.4 $.66$ 19 $1,883.6$ 16.198 108.9 $.67$ 20 $1,412.7$ $16,198$ 75.9 $.47$ 21 941.8 $16,198$ 79.9 $.49$ 22 470.9 $16,198$ 66.0 $.11$	15	3,296.3	16,198	99.9	.62
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	16	2,825.4	16,198	101.3	.63
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	17	2,825.4	16,198	102.3	.63
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	18	2,354.5	16,198	106.4	.66
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	19	1,883.6	16.198	108.9	- 67
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	20	1.412.7	16.198	75.9)17
22 470.9 16 198 66 0 49	21	941.8	16,198	70 0	• + [
	22	470.9	16,198	66.0	•+9 //1

Table 5.--Average annual insect-caused mortality of pine sawtimber reserve per acre in successive years after cutting, by treatment and number of years, 1938-1959

Table 6.--Cumulative insect-caused mortality of pine sawtimber reserve per acre in successive numbers of years after cuttings, by treatment, 1938-1959¹/

Year	:Treatment and	weighted mean	reserve stand	volume (board feet
cutting	: Sanitati : 13,682	on-salvage	: Un : 16	,358
	Board feet	Percent stand	Board feet	Percent stand
l	14.7	0.11	89.3	0.55
2	22.8	.17	172.0	1.05
3	26.8	.20	251.2	1.54
λ_{\pm}	38.2	.28	325.0	1.99
5	53.6	• 39	418.1	2.56
6	68.5	. 50	514.3	3.15
7	77.8	• 57	626.4	3.83
8	108.2	•79	749.3	4.59
9	134.0	•99	878.0	5.37
10	170.0	1.24	1,016.2	6.22
11	204.5	1.49	1,154.7	7.07
12	258.5	1.89	1,301.5	7.97
13	272.7	1.99	1,420.5	8.69
14	297.7	2.18	1,540.7	9.43
15	323.9	2.37	1,640.6	10.04
16	357.7	2.61	1,741.9	10.66
17	384.8	2.81	1,844.2	11.29
18	403.8	2.95	1,950.6	11.94
19	422.0	3.08	2,059.5	12.60
20	473.3	3.46	2,135.4	13.07
21	494.7	3.62	2,215.3	13.56
22	514.9	3.76	2,281.3	13.96

1/ Calculated from data in table 5.

Table 7.--Reduction in insect-caused mortality of pine sawtimber

reserve on sanitation-salvage compartments compared to

				/ ٦
untreated	compartments	, by	years	, <u>1938-1959</u> [±] ∕

Ca	Calendar year		Succ	essiv	e years aft	er cu	tting
Year	: Annual		Number	*	Annual	: (Cumulative
	: reduct:	ion :	of years	:	reduction	:]	reduction
	reicei					ercen	
1938	78.3		1		81.5		80.0
1939	74.3		2		88.0 🗸		83.8
1940	90.3		3		93.8		87.0
1941	81.3		24		82.2		85.9
1942	90.3		5		80.7		84.8
1943	87.5		6		81.4		84.1
1944	96.8		7		90.0		85.1
1945	87.2		8		71.1		82.8
1946	75.5		9		74.7		81.6
1947	87.3		10		69.4		80.1
1948	81.5		11		69.4		78.9
1949	64.9		12		56.0	,	76.3
1950	72.1		13		84.9		77.1
1951	71.3		14		74.3		76.9
1952	68.9		15		66.1		76.4
1953	37.8		16		57.1		75.5
1954	78.4		17		66.7		75.1
1955	72.9		18		75.8		75.3
1956	71.1		19		74.6		75.6
1957	38.1		20		4.3		73.5
1958	87.9		21		65.3		73.3
1959	41.5		22		61.0		73.1

1/ Computed from data in tables 4, 5, and 6 by subtracting sanitation-salvage mortality (percent of stand) from control mortality, and dividing result by control mortality. Sanitation-salvage measured by this standard produced the greatest benefits during the years immediately after cutting. Starting at 81.5 percent the first year after cutting the reduction reached a high of 93.8 percent during the third year (fig. 12). Thereafter it tended to decrease as the length of time after cutting increased, so that by the twentysecond year the volume of timber killed on the cut compartments was only 61 percent below that on the uncut compartments. Cumulated, the mortality was 73.1 percent less for the study period as a whole in stands where the high-risk trees had been removed than in uncut stands. Eaton (1959) reported a similar pattern of loss reduction for this method of cutting. In his study, as in this one, the greatest reduction occurred a few years after cutting rather than immediately thereafter. The evidence from these and other studies (Keen, 1955) supports the belief that stand disturbances from logging probably account for this delayed effect.

The data on mortality reduction over a number of years after cutting show a linear relationship that can be expressed by the regression equation E = 90.9 - 1.71X. Mortality reduction is negatively correlated with time after cutting, and the correlation coefficient -0.61 is statistically highly significant. Actual values of the percent reduction year by year were somewhat closer to the calculated values during the first part of the study period than during the last. This may be due in part to the broader base for the data for the early years after cutting as compared to the later ones, and in part due to decrease in the effects of sanitationsalvage with the passage of time.

These effects can be expected to persist for some time, because while the regression of loss reduction on time after cutting slopes downward (fig. 12), the rate of decline is quite gradual. Even this trend may be lessened somewhat as additional records swell the sample base for what are now the longer intervals since cutting. However, if we assume that the downward trend will continue at no change in rate, it will be 53 years from the time cutting was done before percent of stand mortality on the cut and uncut compartments reaches the same level. Eaton (1959) reported about the same result from his earlier analysis. This is a much longer time span for sanitation-salvage to influence the loss pattern than was anticipated by the originators of this method.

Some degree of decline in the beneficial effects of sanitationsalvage with the passage of time is inevitable in the normal course of events. The reason is that while logging leaves a residual stand that initially is composed entirely of low-risk trees, at least some of these trees can be expected to decline in health as they become older and eventually become high risk. Furniss and Hallin (1955) found that the volume of high-risk trees occurring on four sanitation-salvage compartments at Blacks Mountain between 16 and 17 years after the compartments were cut, averaged 1,110 board feet per acre. This was 37 percent of the volume in high risk originally present on these compartments. At this rate it would take from 43 to 46 years for enough trees in the reserve stand to become high risk to equal the precutting level. This is 7 to 10 years short of the period indicated from the regression analysis described above.



Figure 11.--Cumulative insect-caused mortality in pine sawtimber reserve on cut and uncut compartments.



Figure 12.--Reduction in insect-caused pine sawtimber mortality on sanitation-salvage compartments compared to untreated. Based on percent of stand.

The discrepancy may be attributed in part to the difficulty of applying risk ratings with absolute consistency. These ratings are visual estimates, and to some degree their application is affected by experience and judgment; consequently, findings concerning changes in risk need to be judged accordingly.

CONCLUSIONS

Just how the removal of high-risk trees affects bark beetle infestions is still largely a conjectural matter. In speculating on this point, Bongberg (1949) noted that the effect seems to be ecological. He surmised that during endemic periods, at least, high-risk trees fulfill food requirements for the successful development of broods in a way that lowrisk trees do not. He also pointed out that fewer beetles seem to be required to kill high-risk trees, and that the progeny of beetles attacking such trees are far more numerous than for low-risk trees. His conclusion about the mechanism through which sanitation-salvage affects bark beetle populations is that "when beetles are deprived of their preferred host material by removing the high-risk trees from the stand, populations remaining in the area, or those which have access to the treated area from surrounding untreated stands, are absorbed by the resistant reserve stand." Although this explanation seems plausible, to date it remains largely a hypothesis without a great deal of factual information to support it.

On the question of whether removing the high-risk trees prevents bark beetle epidemics, the evidence from this study is a little more tangible. On the experimental forest, the pattern of insect-caused mortality after sanitation-salvage almost invariably has paralleled that in uncut stands, but at a much lower level. This parallel pattern prevailed even in the early years when relatively small proportions of the total area had been logged. Thus far, the influence of bark beetle populations in untreated compartments has not been enough to nullify the effects of sanitation-salvage, even though the treated and untreated areas are intermingled. Timber mortality of the type characteristic of bark beetle outbreaks has not occurred on the compartments to which sanitation-salvage has been applied.

How successful is this method in providing a high degree of protection during years of epidemic infestations? Miller and Keen (1960) noted that the level of infestations has been low during the period that sanitation-salvage has been under test, and mentioned the lack of proof that the effects of the treatment would stand up under the onslaught of high bark beetle populations.

Between 1937 and 1949, bark beetle infestations on the experimental forest, as well as elsewhere in the eastside pine type, did not reach the destructive level that they had attained during the preceding decade. However, in 1950 and 1951, heavy damage of the type associated with outbreaks did occur in the untreated stands. In 1956, annual mortality in these stands exceeded the average for 1933-1936, the years of severe bark beetle infestations. If the premise were true that the benefits of sanitationsalvage were lost during epidemics, then tree mortality in the treated and untreated stands should have been about equal. This was not the case; rather mortality on the sanitation-salvage compartments remained much lower than it was on the uncut compartments in all years.

We previously noted that sanitation-salvage was one of several methods of cutting tested on 20-acre plots in a separate study at Blacks Mountain (Eaton, 1959). The effects of this method on post-cutting mortality were about the same in both studies, although the mortality on the plots was substantially below that on the compartments in the present analysis, irrespective of the treatment. Because of inherent weaknesses in small plots for studies of insect-caused mortality in old-growth stands, Eaton concluded that the data from the compartments are probably the more reliable since they have a much larger base.

In the 22 years covered by this study, insects have not yet killed the amount of timber in uncut stands equivalent to the 2,650 board feet per acre removed by sanitation-salvage. They have killed 2,281 board feet per acre. Theoretically, only about three-fourths of this volume can be considered susceptible, because in stands from which the high-risk trees had been cut, insects killed some 515 board feet per acre in the same period. Presumably a comparable amount makes up the remaining quarter of the total mortality on the uncut. The results thus support previous findings that the practical effect of removing the high-risk trees through sanitation-salvage cutting is one of getting to these trees ahead of the beetles.

Sanitation-salvage cutting has proved economically as well as technically feasible in forests managed for timber production. It has shown promise as a protective measure in forests managed primarily for recreation (Hall, 1958). High-risk trees yield timber grades comparable to the stand as a whole (Garland, 1940), and the cost of logging these trees is only slightly higher than for harvest cuttings (Hasel, 1946). At 1961 prices, sanitation-salvage at Blacks Mountain would have resulted in savings in stumpage values aggregating \$62 per acre that otherwise would have been lost to insects over the 22 years studied. The actual savings have not been this large because of lower stumpage prices in the years of cutting.

The effectiveness of this method of reducing insect-caused damage in old-growth stands of eastside pine has been recognized almost from the start of the trials at Blacks Mountain. Bongberg (1949), commenting upon the results achieved in the first decade, observed: "The sustained benefits of control over the period of 10 years have far exceeded original expectations." To this we can add that after more than two decades, the effects of the treatment are still quite remarkable.

SUMMARY

Insects, notably bark beetles, are a major cause of tree mortality in ponderosa pine forests. They are especially destructive to unmanaged old-growth stands. In the early attempts to convert such stands to a managed condition, the insect control measures available could be applied only to infested trees. About 25 years ago, sanitation-salvage cutting was conceived as a means of reducing the damage by logging the insectsusceptible or high-risk trees before the beetles attack them.

The first trial of sanitation-salvage occurred on the Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest in northeastern California, where logging high-risk trees was started in 1937. Early results were so promising that the cutting was extended over most of the 10,252-acre forest in the next 14 years, except for certain areas reserved in a natural condition or for other reasons. Tree mortality in cut and uncut stands has been measured annually since the start of this test. The records for the 22-year period, 1938 to 1959, have been analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this method of control.

The original volume of pine sawtimber per acre averaged about 17,000 board feet on the compartments studied. Logging reduced this volume on the sanitation-salvage compartments by 2,653 board feet (1.9 trees) per acre, or 15.6 percent, leaving a reserve stand averaging 14,354 board feet per acre.

Bark beetles accounted for 75 percent of the total pine sawtimber that died following sanitation-salvage, and 91 percent of the mortality in the unlogged stands during this period. The average volume killed annually in the treated compartments was 0.143 percent of stand; in the untreated compartments the mortality was 0.608 percent of stand, or more than four times greater.

The volume of timber killed by insects fluctuated from one calendar year to the next, but was consistently much lower in stands where the high-risk trees had been cut than in uncut stands. In both types of stand, however, the loss trends between 1938 and 1959 were remarkably similar.

The mortality in successive numbers of years after cutting showed the same consistent and striking differences between treated and untreated stands as calendar-year mortality. The total volume of timber killed where the high-risk trees had been logged was only 3.76 percent of stand, or 515 board feet per acre for the 22 years. In the same period, the losses in uncut stands totaled 13.96 percent of stand, or 2,281 board feet per acre.

Sanitation-salvage reduced the toll taken by insects the most during the years immediately after cutting. The reduction was largest during the third year when the mortality in the treated stands dropped 93.8 percent below that in untreated ones. Thereafter, the effects of the cutting declined, so that by the twenty-second year, insects killed about two-fifths as much timber in the logged stands as in unlogged ones. The results indicate that reductions in losses, achievable by logging high-risk trees in old-growth ponderosa-Jeffrey pine stands, are negatively correlated with time after cutting. They substantiate previous findings about this method of insect control. Projections of the data suggest that it will take about 50 years from the time of cutting for percent of stand mortality in cut and uncut stands to reach the same level.

In.

Anonymous.

1938. The Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest of the California Forest and Range Experiment Station. U.S. Forest Serv. Calif. Forest and Range Expt. Sta., 17 pp., illus.

Bongberg, J. W.

- 1949. Results of 10 years of bark beetle control by logging highrisk trees, Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest, Lassen County, California. U.S. Bur. Ent. and Plant Quar., Forest Insect Lab., 11 pp., illus.
- Downing, G. L.
 - 1956. Instructions for conducting the annual cruise of insectcaused losses on the Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest. U.S. Forest Serv. Calif. Forest and Range Expt. Sta., 24 pp., illus.

Eaton, Charles B.

1959. Insect-caused mortality in relation to methods of cutting in ponderosa pine on the Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest. U.S. Forest Serv. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Expt. Sta. Tech. Paper 43. 33 pp., illus.

Furniss, M. M. and Hallin, W. E.

1955. Development of high-risk trees in ponderosa and Jeffrey pine stands following sanitation-salvage cutting. U.S. Forest Serv. Calif. Forest and Range Expt. Sta. Res. Note 94. 2 pp.

Garland, Hereford.

1940. Log and tree values of the 1939 Blacks Mountain mill study. U.S. Forest Serv. Calif. Forest and Range Expt. Sta. 34 pp., illus.

Hall, R. C.

1958. Sanitation-salvage controls bark beetles in southern California recreation area. Jour. Forestry 56(1):9-11, illus.

Hallin, William E.

1959. The application of unit area control in the management of ponderosa-Jeffrey pine at Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest. U.S. Dept. Agr. Tech. Bul. 1191. 96 pp., illus.

Hasel, A. A.

1946. Logging cost as related to tree size and intensity of cutting in ponderosa pine. Jour. Forestry 44(8):552-560, illus.

Hopkins, A. D.

1909. Bark beetles of the genus Dendroctonus. U.S. Dept. Agr. Bul. 83, Pt. I, 169 pp., illus.

Johnson, P. C.

1946. Effect of sanitation-salvage cuttings upon subsequent insectcaused pine mortality, Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest, California. Progress report, 1937-1943. U.S. Bur. Ent. and Plant Quar., Forest Insect Lab., 13 pp., illus.

Keen, F. P.

- 1936. Relative susceptibility of ponderosa pine to bark-beetle attack. Jour. Forestry 34(10):919-927, illus.
- 1955. A progress report on insect mortality studies on cutover ponderosa pine lands. U.S. Forest Serv. Calif. Forest and Range Expt. Sta. 17 pp.
 - , and Salman, K. A.
- 1942. Progress in pine beetle control through tree selection. Jour. Forestry 40(11):854-858.
- Miller, J. M. and Keen, F. P. 1960. Biology and control of the western pine beetle. U.S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Pub. 800. 381 pp., illus.
- Person, H. L. 1928. Tree selection by the western pine beetle. Jour. Forestry 26(5):564-578, illus.
- Salman, K. A.
 - 1935. A survey of forest insect infestations in cutover areas in California. U.S. Bur. Ent. and Plant Quar., Forest Insect Lab. 86 pp., illus.

, and Bongberg, J. W.

1942. Logging high-risk trees to control insects in the pine stands of northeastern California. Jour. Forestry 40(7):533-539. Table 8. --Average annual insect-caused mortality of pine sawtimber per acre in the reserve stand, following sanitation-salvage cutting, by compartment and calendar year

1947	 Recut 21.9 17.3	0 11.6	3.5 11.1	91- 1- 0 1- 0 0 0 0 0	21.8 	cut 6.4
	39.6 54.8 5.0	ut		31.2 t 70.1 Recut - Recut - 0	Recut - Recut - t Recut - 38.9 35.4	Rec cut 14.1
1945	 30.9 79.8 59.6	12.0 0 ut - Rec	ut	3.6 - Recu 6.6 7.0	0 	0 Re 18.6
: 4146T		8°2 - Rec -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0 O O O	н	0 1 1
1943	0010	 54°50 54°50	11000100	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	••••••	
1942	20.2	°.4 •.4	0 0 0 0	27°90 8°7	19-90 19-90 19-90 19-90 19-90 140-14	
1941	Board 1 61.8 3.3 3.3	13.2 1.1 2.1	16.3 7.44 0	82.4 0 7.7 0 7.7		
1940	12.4 12.4	17.0 19.0 19.0 19.0	то т ма ма ма ма ма ма ма ма ма ма ма ма ма			
1939	132.5 68.9 33.6	28.0 15.0 19.8				
1938	222.9 222.9 34.8					
n stand cre	8					
ve gree e per a	13,906 13,057 18,434 21,927	12,190 12,498 17,469 16,147	14,033 14,666 21,573 21,176 9,431 12,741 12,741 12,917 9,332	23,880 10,246 9,119 9,119 15,111 14,162 10,403 13,039	13,494 13,494 12,025 14,121 15,670 17,325 16,178 15,909 15,909 12,512	17,319 13,327 14,024
: Reser	3					
limbered trea	Acres 79.0 81.3 94.8 46.9	113.7 95.7 105.0 63.5	111.6 91.1 53.4 86.7 52.0 52.0 52.0 52.0 48.1	115.2 115.2 88.8 83.5 13	94.5 53.4 71.4 85.6 84.3 84.3 50.8 51.9 84.3 51.4 51.9	86.1 126.2 66.6
lent :						
ompartn	0-17 0-17 0-17 0-17	27-1 27-1 15-15	6.9.1.1.6.9 1.1.1.5.9 1.1.1.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5	20-33-333 20-33-333 20-33-333 20-33-333 20-33-333 20-33-333 20-33-33 20-33-33 20-33-33 20-33-33 20-33-33 20-33-33 20-4 20-4 20-4 20-4 20-4 20-4 20-4 20-4	8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	7-6 10-1 7-24
Ŭ	0000	мдсс	000000000	0000AAAA	андасосос	000
Year of cutting	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942 1944

APPENDIX

111

| | |

| | |

111

| | |

| | |

18,000 14,032 14,351

74•9 73•2 96•3

24-7 27-6 29-10

д д д

1951

~	ł
Ň	ł
2	1
2	l
1	ų
*	1
+	I
12	1
0	I
0	1
T	
1	
0	
(1)	
ř	
<u>`</u>	
17	
2	
-	

ł

Year of cutting	: 1948	: 1949	: 1950	1951	1952	1953	1954 :	1955	1956	: 7361	1958	1959
1937	60.4 2.5	ecut		13.9 59.3		feet 67.3 67.3 8.1	27.3 27.3 448.8	 12.1 Cruise	 76.3 	146.5	32.2	1 1 0 1 1 5 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1
1938	1.6 21.7 	31.0 54.2 	65.5	24.4 1.9	31.4 0 	36.3	20.0 8.1		28.2 28.2 	scut		12:3
1939	8 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	131.2 39.3 0			110000000	69.55 69.00	Cruise Cruise 24.0	 terminated 30.8 Cruise	 52.7 terminated	58.111		91°4
1940	8.0 57.7 Recut Recut Recut 103.6	82.4 60.3 16.8	46.0 67.8 67.8 477.1 121.6	26.5 26.5 26.1 26.1	12.8 57.0 121.9 121.9	46.0 2.9 31.6 31.6	38.5 170.3	Cruise .	terminated 	30.7	· · · ° · · · · ·	⁰
Т <i>ф</i> СТ	Recut Recut 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 2.8 32.8 00	46.4 	46.4 35.4 31.5 81.5 8.1	50.5 81.11 18.12 18.12	24.2 20.8 20.8 20.8 20.8 20.8 20.8 20.8 20	41.4 10.2 10.2 149.5 86.5 60.2	10.4 1.1.2 7.9 0000	28.7 10.2 Cruise Cruise	25.0 52.5 terminated terminated terminated	65.8	- Recut	22.5
1942 1044		ecut 78.h									т	
1951					66.9 31.7 102.8	000 500 500	0.8 4 0.8 4	43.9 33.4	37.7 5.2 114.1	22.0 71.2 16.7	3.1	38.7 60.4

Compart- ment	-:Timbered	l:Reserve green stand :volume per acre	¹ 1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
	Acres				Board	feet -					
G12-10	111.6	16,598	211.8	Cut							
G12-14	91.1	17,426	28.5	Cut							
G14-6	86.7	13,428	135.2	Cut							
G15-10	131.9	12,045	64.8	Cut							
G15-13	52.0	16,384	183.6	Cut							
G11-4	115.2	12,389	49.8	114.7	Cut						
G11-8	88.8	21,151	4.7	179.9	Cut						
G18-9	63.5	10,340	0	30.7	Cut						
P15-33	139.1	17,609	55•3	56.5	Cut						
P18-30	88.6	17,114	198.8	299.6	Cut						
c8 - 30	94.5	16,370	38.4	169.1	106.6	Cut					
C11-33	53-4	16,687	0	0	28.3	Cut					
C14-28	123.9	17,362	49.2	80.8	33•3	Cut					
C15-23	100.3	18,619	3 ⁴ •7	47.5	51.5	Cut					
C15-25	71.4	17,299	33.1	115.6	65.4	Cut					
P18- 27	84.3	19,811	98.5	149.6	227.6	Cut					
G7 - 6	86.1	19,784	20.0	57.4	84.0	0					
G10-1	126.2	15,650	80.6	50.3	46.7	22.0 (Cut				
C7 - 24	66.6	16,109	29.8	42.3	164.5	15.6	99•3	0 (Cut		
в27 - б	73.2	16 ,09 6	55•3	314.7	178.6	94.2	69.5	28.0	41.9	120.6	166.4
₿29 - 10	96.3	16,398	232.3	118.6	156.5	90.9	3.2	17.9	95.2	123.0	83.2
A21-10	64.7	13,103	0	45.9	6.6	11.9	0	35•7	35•7	97.9	46.2
B24-4	91.2	14,943	92.8	168.7	128.1	75.8	9.8	63.8	48.1	101.4	20.9
C4-21	72.0	17,055	75-9	149.9	80.8	16.7	45.7	30.8	21.2	84.0	95.6
G2-12	143.1	16,918	66.5	74.0	283.8	90.3	86.6	0	63.5	185.8	88.5
P21-28	99•9	17,698	64.7	217.6	220.1	66.4	68.8	42.7	29.7	123.9	60.8

Table 9. --Average annual insect-caused mortality of pine sawtimber per acre in uncut stands, by compartment and calendar year

Compart- ment	:	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
							- Boa	rd fee	<u>t</u>					
G12-10														
G12-14		-												
G14-6														
G15-10														
G15-13														
G11-4														
G11-8													64 GR	
G18-9														~~
P15-33														
P18-30												~ -		
c 8-30														
C11-33												aan 200		
C14-28													·	
C15-23														
C15-25														
P18-27														
G7-6														
G10-1														
C7-24														
в27-6		16.0	331.1	193.9	163.3	Cut								
B29-10]	49.6	185.4	194.6	297.8	Cut	~-							
A21-10		35•7	107.7	130.4	238.3	90.8	128.2	118.2	67.3	134.6	169.9	29.2	11.9	59.2
B24-4		86.0	106.1	135.2	179.5	233.0	18.0	30.1	84.5	5 0. 8	264.0	48.8	32.7	67.5
C4-21]	164.1	49.0	92.7	154.2	141.5	53.5	59.2	22.9	24.3	108.9	46.5	164.1	8.2
G2-12		77.4	55.9	141.9	189.1	201.5	233.4	42.0	102.3	94.0	261.2	42.9	126.6	101.6
P21-28		84.7	143.3	198.7	158.4	164.1	90.4	75.8	103.4	168.1	175.1	161.9	104.8	59-9

	Percent stand cut		16.0 13.5 15.0	17.7 23.5 13.4	15. 15. 13.0 251.0 23.4 23.4 23.4 23.4 23.4 23.4 24.5 25.0 23.4 24.5 25.0 25.0 25.0 25.0 25.0 25.0 25.0 25	10.5 11.8 10.7 10.7 10.7 10.7 10.7 10.7 10.7 10.7
	e stand : Volume	Board feet	13,906 13,057 18,434 21,927	12,190 12,498 17,469 16,147	14,033 14,666 21,573 20,176 9,431 12,742 15,917 9,332 9,332	23,880 10,246 9,119 9,119 10,403 13,039 13,039
	Reservent Number trees		18.7 19.4 25.1	17.7 16.7 21.0 27.7	11 02 04 00 04 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	20.01 10.010
b Lt	ut Volume	Board	e 2,659 3,864 3,888 3,883	2,625 3,840 2,697 3,574	8,556 760 750 750 750 750 750 750 750 750 750 75	2,715 2,143 2,548 2,958
ompartme	Number trees		n-salvag 2.7 2.0 3.0	10.15 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	0004004000 000000000000000000000000000	
cut, and c	l stand . Volume	Board feet	Sanitatic 16,565 15,921 21,322 25,810	14,815 16,338 20.166 19,721	16,589 17,426 24,796 13,428 12,045 16,384 19,031	26,595 21,151 21,389 10,340 17,609 11,604 11,604
ent, year	Origina Number trees		21.4 21.9 28.13	50.5 50.5 50.5 50.5 50.5 50.5 50.5 50.5	16.5 19.8 11.3 17.0 11.8 11.8	21.8 21.8 21.2 21.2 21.2 21.2 21.2 21.2
by treatme	Area	Acres	79.0 81.3 94.8 16.9	113.7 95.7 105.0 63.5	1111.6 91.1 53.4 131.9 48.1 48.1 48.1	1132-0 1132-0 1303-0 1303-0 101-1 131-1 101-101-
cutting	Compart - ment		G 0-14 G 2-14 G 6-10 G 8-10	B 25-1 B 27-4 G 4-15 G 15-5	B 12-10 G 12-14 G 12-14 G 15-10 G 15-13 G 17-3 G 17-3	G 9-10 G 11-4 G 11-4 F 15-33 F 18-9 F 18-33 F 20-32 F 20-32
	Year of cutting		1937	1938	1939	

Table 10. --Area, number of trees, and volume of pine sawtimber stand per acre before and after

Year			: Origina.	l stand :	Cr	1t :	Reserve	stand :	Percent
of cutting	Compart- ment	Area	Number trees	Volume	Number trees	Volume	Number : trees	Volume	stand cut <u>1</u> /
		Acres		Board feet		Board feet		Board feet	
				Sanitation	n-salvage	0			
1941	C 8-30	94.5 53.4	12.5	16,370 16,687		2,875	11.4 11.4	13,495	17.6
	C 13-31	85.9	13.0	14,165		2,140	11.2	12,025	15.1
	C 14-28	.123.9	16.6	17,362	1.9	3,241	7.41	14,121	.18.7
	C 15-23	100.3	20.3	18,619	J.0	2,793	19.3	15,826	15.0
	C 15-25	71.4	21.4	17,299	л•4	1,629	20.0	15,670	9.4
	P 18-27	84.3	22.6	19,811	2.4	2,486	20.2	17,325	12.5
	P 19-25	36.6	20.7	18,708	1.8	2,530	18.9	16,178	13.5
	P 22-24	47.1	21.2	18,596	2.4	2,687	18.8	15,909	14.4
	P 23-31	50.8	15.6	14,891	0.	1,314	14.8	13,577	0.0
	P 24-21	51.9	19.3	16,194	2.9	3,682	16.4	12,512	22.7
1942	G 7-6	86.1	15.3	19,784	1.0	2,465	14.3	17,319	12.5
	G 10-1	126.2	13.3	15,650	1.2	2,323	12.1	13,327	14.8
1944	C 7-24	66.6	21.5	16,109	1.5	2,084	20.0	14,025	12.9
1951	B 24-7	74.9	26.1	20.064	1.7	2.064	24.4	18.000	10.3
	B 27-6	73.2	21.1	16,096	7•7	2,064	19.4	14,032	12.8
	B 29-10	.96.3	20.2	16,398	1.6	2,047	18.6	14,351	12.5
				Untre	eated				
	A 21-10	64.7	10. Ţ	13,103	0	0	10.7	13,103	0
	B 24-4	91.2	22.6	14,943	0.	0	22.6	14,943	0
	C 4-21	72.0	22.2	17,055	0	0	22.2	17,055	0
	G 2-12	143.1	19.9	16,918	0	0	19.9	16,918	0
	P 21-28	9.9	21.4	17,698	0	0	21.4	17,698	0
L /T	Computed b: 1+ to nerge	vibivib v	g the volu Jata for p	me cut, by	the volu	ume in the	original	stand, and	convert-
NCDT SITT	TO NO NCTON	TTU •01	TOT DO DO	· ATTO DIT					

Table 10. --Continued

Compartment	: Area	•	Reserve stand	*	Period	: Annual	mortality
	Acres		Board feet		Years	Board feet	Percent stand
			Sanitation-s	al	vage		
G 0-14	79.0		13,906		9	18.8	0.14
G 2-14	81.3		13,057		22	31.3	.24
G 6-10	94.8		18,434		5	26.7	.14
G 8-10	46.9		21,927		17	20.2	• 09
B 25-1	113.7		12,190		16	18.0	.15
в 27-4	95.7		12,498		21	12.6	.10
G 4-15	105.0		17,469		5	7.9	.05
G 15-15	63.5		16,147		4	11.6	• 07
G 12-10	111.6		14,033		3	14.4	.10
G 12-14	91.1		14,666		3	5.2	• O ¹ +
G 14-3	53.4		21,573		14	23.5	.11
G 14-6	86.7		10,176		14	12.6	.12
G 15-10	131.9		9,431		20	23.2	.25
G 15-13	52.0		12,742		3	0.8	.01
G 17-3	21.9		15,917	-	15	15.2	.10
G 17-6	48.1		9,332		15	1.7	. 02
G 9-10	32.9		23,880		14	35.8	.15
G 11-4	115.2		10,246		3	0	0
G 11-8	88.8		18,603		3	0	0
G 18-9	63.5		9,119		19	22.3	.24
P 15-33	139.1		15,111		4	0.3	0
P 18-30	88.6		14,162		. 4	9.2	• 06
P 18-33	31.1		10,403		14	32.1	.31
P 20-32	43.9		13,039		14	28.4	.22
C 8-30	94.5		13,495		15	19.7	.15
C 11-33	53.4		13,860		3	14.7	.11
C 13-31	85.9		12,025		3	0	0
C 14-28	123.9		14,121		18	14.6	.10
C 15-23	100.3		15,826		2	0	0
C 15-25	71.4		15,670		2	0	0
P 18-27	84.3		17,325		3	7.1	• O4
P 19-25	36.6		16,178		13	37.1	.23
P 22-24	47.1		15,909		13	35+3	.22
P 23-31	50.8		13,577		13	20.2	.15
P 24-21	51.9		12,512		18	11.9	.10
G 7-6	86.1		17,319		3	4.9	.03
G 10-1	126.2		13,327		l	0	0
C 7-24	66.6		14,024		15	40.8	.29
B 24-7	74.9		18,000		8	21.1	.12
в 27-6	73.2		14,032		8	30.2	.22
B 29-10	96.3		14,351		8	38.7	.27
Weighted m	nean ¹ /		13,682			19.5	0.14
Mean			14,354			20.8	.14
S. E.			±52.5			±1.5	

Table 11. -- Average annual insect-caused mortality of pine sawtimber reserve per acre during period after cutting, by compart-

ments, 1938-1959

Compartment	: Area	:	Reserve stand	: Per	riod	: Anı	nual 1	nortalit	У
·····	Acres		Board feet	Ye	ears	Board	feet	Percent	stand
			Untrea	ted					
G 12-10	111.6		16,589		l	21	1.8	1.	.28
G 12-14	91.1		17,426		1	28	3.5	0	.16
G 14-6	86.7		13,428		l	13	5.2	1.	.01
G 15-10	131.9		12,045		1	61	+.8		• 54
G 15-13	52.0		16,384		1	18	3.6	l.	.12
G 11-4	115.2		12,389		2	82	2.3		.66
G 11-8	88.8		21,151		2	- 92	2.3		<u>.</u> 44
G 18-9	63.5		10,340		2	1	5.4		.15
P 15-33	139.1		17,609		2	5	5.9		• 32
P 18-30	88.6		17,114		2	249	9.2	1	.46
C 8-30	94.5		16,370		3	10/	4.7		• 64
C 11-33	53.4		16,687		3	(9.4	-	• 06
C 14-28	123.9		17,362		3	51	4.4		.31
C 15-23	100.3		18,619		3	41	4.6		•24
C 15-25	71.4		17,299		3	7.	1.4		.41
P 18-27	84.3		19,811		3	15	8.6		.80
G 7-6	86.1		19,784		4	4	0.4	•	.20
G 10-1	126.2		15,650		4	49	9.9		• 32
C 7-24	66.6		16,109		6	5	8.6		• 36
в 27-6	73.2		16,096		13	130	5.4		.85
B 29-10	96.3		16,398		13	13	4.5		. 82
A 21-10	64.7		13,103		22	7	2.8		• 56
B 24-4	91.2		14,943		22	9	3.0		• 62
C 4-21	72.0		17,055		22	70	5.8		•45
G 2-12	143.1		16,918		22	110	8.6		.70
P 21-28	99.9		17,698		22	11/	7.4		.66
Weighted a	mean ¹ /		16,358			9	9.5	0	.61
Mean			16,339			9	6.8		• 59
S. E.			±48.4			±	5.4		

I/ Weighted by area and years. To compute weighted mean reserve stand volume, for example, multiply number of acres times number of years' records times board feet per acre for each compartment; then add products and divide result by the sum of acres times years for all compartments.

Wickman, Boyd E., and Eaton, Charles B.

1962. The effects of sanitation-salvage cutting on insect-caused pine mortality at Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest: 1938-1959. U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Expt. Sta. Tech. Paper 66, 39 pp., illus.

The volume of timber killed by bark beetles in oldgrowth pine fluctuated from one calendar year to the next, but was consistently much lower than on uncut compartments. The results indicate that reductions in losses on sanitation-salvage treated compartments are negatively correlated with time after cutting. Projections of the data suggest that it will take about 50 years from the time of cutting for percent of stand mortality in cut and uncut stands to reach the same level. The results substantiate previous findings about this method of insect control.

Wickman, Boyd E., and Eaton, Charles B.

1962. The effects of sanitation-salvage cutting on insect-caused pine mortality at Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest: 1938-1959. U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Expt. Sta. Tech. Paper 66, 39 pp., illus.

The volume of timber killed by bark beetles in oldgrowth pine fluctuated from one calendar year to the next, but was consistently much lower than on uncut compartments. The results indicate that reductions in losses on sanitation-salvage treated compartments are negatively correlated with time after cutting. Projections of the data suggest that it will take about 50 years from the time of cutting for percent of stand mortality in cut and uncut stands to reach the same level. The results substantiate previous findings about this method of insect control.

Wickman, Boyd E., and Eaton, Charles B.

1962. The effects of sanitation-salvage cutting on insect-caused pine mortality at Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest: 1938-1959. U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Expt. Sta. Tech. Paper 66, 39 pp., illus.

The volume of timber killed by bark beetles in oldgrowth pine fluctuated from one calendar year to the next, but was consistently much lower than on uncut compartments. The results indicate that reductions in losses on sanitation-salvage treated compartments are negatively correlated with time after cutting. Projections of the data suggest that it will take about 50 years from the time of cutting for percent of stand mortality in cut and uncut stands to reach the same level. The results substantiate previous findings about this method of insect control.







